THE COURT: Mr. Gata-Aura, do you agree with that? First, of all, you went over the indictment with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: You are entering a plea of not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

- THE COURT: All right. Please be seated.
- 2 MR. ZELIN: Thank you.
- THE COURT: Let's figure out where this is all headed.

 Mr. Vainberg or is it Mr. Bell?

Mr. Vainberg or is it Mr. Bell?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. BELL: Good afternoon, Judge. Since this is essentially doubles as a presentment as well, it may behoove everybody for the following to happen first: for Mr. Gata-Aura to be advised of certain of his rights, as typically happens in magistrate court, particularly his right to counsel — obviously, he has retained counsel — and his right not to answer any questions.

THE COURT: If I know Mr. Zelin, and I think I do, he probably has been over all them. Were there any other issues?

MR. BELL: No, your Honor, just a matter of getting those in the records. I'm sure Mr. Zelin has been over those as well as.

MR. ZELIN: I have, your Honor. My client is fully apprised of all of his constitutional rights. I believe that he understands them. I do appreciate the government calling that to your Honor's attention. We would waive any further need for --

THE COURT: Allocution?

MR. ZELIN: -- allocution on the record, if your Honor please.

MR. BELL: Thank you, your Honor. We will also note

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. BELL: To be clear, the Moore indictment is still pending, it is still active. These are additional charges as to a new defendant. They were essentially superseded to this case because they deal with the same set of operative facts. But it is not something that would tend to either disturb the Moore charges nor for today's purposes prompt Moore to be arraigned on the superseder, as Moore is not named within it.

THE COURT: But it may impact it. That was my first impression. We have a trial scheduled with Mr. Moore on June 3rd. I was just supposing that I were Mr. Moore's counsel,

J5 case 12:18-cr-00759-JSR Document 77 Filed 06/28/19 Page 5 of 13

which of course I'm not, how would I react to this superseding indictment.

MR. BELL: I would suspect, Judge, that at the end of the day Mr. Moore, whose position has been that he has wanted a speedy trial, will not have an application with respect to the scheduling in light of the Gata-Aura indictment, and we would proceed accordingly and Mr. Gata-Aura's case can proceed on its own track.

THE COURT: They are almost identical. I don't have that kind of photographic memory, but I read the superseding indictment this morning, and it struck me as substantially similar if not the same to the Moore indictment.

MR. BELL: They are, Judge. To situate things, both Mr. Gata-Aura and Mr. Moore, as alleged, are charged with having assisted Renwick Haddow or partnered with Renwick Haddow and having solicited investors into the business known as Bar Works in similar fashion, having recruited people under them to essentially make investment pitches to investors. Both are charged with having done so on false pre-tenses, most notably concerning the identity of the management of Bar Works.

Factually, your Honor is of course right that they are related.

What might make the most sense is this. It may make sense for your Honor to place upon the docket an order to Mr. Moore's counsel essentially asking whether he has any further application in light of the Gata-Aura superseding indictment.

My expectation is that he will not, particularly because he has sought a speedy trial to this point and because the government is not suggesting that the existence of the Gata-Aura case should push Moore's case further into the future or that the two things have to be tried as one trial.

My colleague Mr. Vainberg spoke very briefly to Mr. Moore's counsel, David Garvin Esq., this morning and was not of the belief that he had any sort of application to put in. But it may make sense for your Honor to make an order accordingly just to be safe.

Assuming for the moment that Mr. Garvin does not want to order the scheduling of his client's trial, then we are looking at two trials here. They are two trials that would be pretty short, two trials that would be pretty similar.

Assuming of course that they go all the way there, which statistically that may not happen.

It seems to me, Judge, that we would be able to proceed apace with the Moore trial, which is scheduled for the 3rd, and to schedule further proceedings with respect to this defendant as we ordinarily would, which is to say we can make representations with respect to what discovery there is to be produced, with respect to how long it might take Mr. Gata-Aura and his attorney to review those materials, and set a further schedule for pretrial conference and motions and the like.

That, your Honor, respectfully, would be the course that the

government sees going forward from here.

2.3

THE COURT: You have more information than I if you have spoken to Mr. Moore's counsel. When I was posing in chambers to myself what might happen, I was thinking that if I were Mr. Moore's counsel, I might want to take a look at all the discovery that gets produced in this case, for example.

MR. BELL: That is a very valid point, Judge. To that point I would say this. The discovery is going to be substantially identical because we, in producing materials to Mr. Moore, essentially produced the bulk of what we have with respect to the conspiracy as a whole, which includes both persons. Between that and the fact that there is not a single indictment that includes both Moore and Gata-Aura, this seems to be going on two parallel but staggered tracks.

That said, should Mr. Moore come back in response to your Honor's order that we propose and suggest something otherwise. Of course, the government would be happy to participate in whatever discussions follow. But I suspect strongly, given our conversations with Mr. Moore so far as well as his prior position, that we are probably headed for a June 3rd trial start with respect to Mr. Moore.

THE COURT: I would modify your suggestion somewhat.

I think it would be important to have Mr. Moore's counsel in court with you. And in Mr. Zelin wants to be here, he is certainly welcome to being here to put on the record these

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

indictment, the conference on May 29th will consider any implications that one indictment might have on the other, if any.

Now, I think you were heading to a discussion of bail.

Mr. Bell, is that where you were heading?

MR. BELL: I was, Judge, yes. The parties have agreed upon a proposed package which I will have Mr. Vainberg, who is closer to it, introduce for you.

MR. VAINBERG: Your Honor, I believe the parties have reached agreement on a package that incorporates the conditions in the pretrial services report along with a personal recognizance bond of \$1 million secured by \$5,000 in either cash or a confession of judgment against an asset worth more than \$5,000, and two co-signers, one of whom we understand to be the defendant's wife.

THE COURT: What else?

MR. VAINBERG: With a time period of 10 days to satisfy those conditions pending which time the government has no objection to the defendant being released.

THE COURT: What about things like his passport?

MR. VAINBERG: As listed in the pretrial services report, he must surrender his passport.

THE COURT: What I am trying to get you to do is enumerate all of the conditions on the record.

MR. VAINBERG: Yes, of course. He would have to report to pretrial services as directed, surrender his travel documents and make no new applications for travel documents, restrict his travel to the Southern District of New York and the Eastern District of New York, seek or maintain employment

^{J5}Cត់ទe¹:18-cr-00759-JSR Document 77 Filed 06/28/19 Page 10 of 13

as approved by pretrial services, not consume excessive alcohol, not contact the victims of this offense, and not engage in any activity related to the instant offense, particularly investment solicitation, during the pendency of the case.

THE COURT: A small point, Mr. Zelin. Is alcohol an issue here? I did I read somewhere that your client consumes alcohol daily. Or am I just misremembering?

MR. ZELIN: Your Honor, I'm looking at page 3 of the pretrial services report. It indicates, and I quote, "The defendant indicated no history of mental health treatment, substance abuse history, alcohol abuse or substance abuse treatment."

THE COURT: Right. But the very next sentence.

MR. ZELIN: "The defendant consented to a urinalysis."

Oh, it states that he consumes alcohol. I'm sorry, your Honor.

"He states that he consumes alcohol daily." I do see where that is indicated.

THE COURT: That raises to me not a red flag but certainly a question. Is there any question, any issue there?

MR. ZELIN: Not to my knowledge, your Honor. But he will comply with all of the requirements that were set forth by the government. To the extent that it includes no excessive alcohol, there will not be excessive alcohol.

THE COURT: We have pretrial services here, I believe,

right?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, your Honor.

3

2

THE COURT: Is that an issue that you all discussed?

4

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I did not prepare the report. I'm

5 6

there be no excessive alcohol in case there are any issues with

just here representing the office. We would just ask that

7

regards to any arrest-related things involving alcohol or any

8

problems at home involving alcohol, and if so, that it be

9

reported to the Court.

10

THE COURT: When it says report to pretrial services,

11

what does that mean essentially? Show up in your office, and

12

if so, how often?

13

depending on the defendant's compliance, he will be required to

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, your Honor. As directed,

14 15

come to the office. That could be once a month, that could be

16

weekly depending on how he is doing, or it could be once a

17

quarter, with telephone and web reporting as well.

18

moment let's assume there were no other case. What kind of

THE COURT: Mr. Zelin, what is your sense? For the

MR. ZELIN: Your Honor, it was my inclination and my

19 20

time frame would you see this proceeding on from your

21

perspective?

22

suggestion to the government that the government and I meet and

2.3

confer. At this juncture I have absolutely no understanding as

24 25

to the scope and universe of discovery. I would respectfully

2.3

request that I be given some opportunity to discuss that with the government before I commit to any time frames.

If I could circle back to the conditions of release.

It is my understanding, your Honor, that my client's passport was taken by the government this morning when he was taken into custody.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, your Honor, that is our understanding as well, that the agent has it.

MR. BELL: Judge, if you like, we can give you an outline of discovery or we can just meet and confer and get back.

THE COURT: I think Mr. Zelin has a good point. You and he should meet and confer on whatever you want to meet and confer on, discovery to be sure. That would be a perfect item to take up on the 29th.

MR. BELL: Very good.

THE COURT: As a first item or early item.

MR. ZELIN: Yes, your Honor.

MR. BELL: That's fine, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Are there any other issues that the government has or the defense, I'll start with the government, before we adjourn?

MR. VAINBERG: Not for the government other than an application.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ZELIN: Nothing further from the defense, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Is this a speedy trial application?

MR. VAINBERG: Yes, your Honor.

MR. ZELIN: Your Honor, I have had an opportunity to discuss my client's rights with regard to the Speedy Trial Act. My client has authorized me to waive the time between now and -- we were prepared to go out further than May 29th, but certainly between now and May 29th. I would respectfully submit that your Honor determine that it is with good cause and in the interests of justice for the time to be waived.

THE COURT: I will in fact find under 18 United States Code section 3161 that the proposed adjournment to May 29, 2019, joined in by both sides, is appropriate and warrants exclusion of the adjourned time from speedy trial calculations. I further find that the exclusion is designed to prevent any possible miscarriage of justice, to facilitate these proceedings, and to guarantee effective representation of and preparation by counsel for both parties. Thus, the need for exclusion and the ends of justice outweigh the interests of the public and the defendant in this matter in a speedy trial pursuant to 18 U.S.C. sections 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B).

Unless there is anything further, we can be adjourned for today. I'll see you all on the 29th.

(Adjourned)